

WASHINGTON.

Favorable Turn for General Babcock in the Safe Burglary Case.

COLONEL WHITLEY'S LETTER PRODUCED. Innocent Character of the General's Assurances Established.

DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES.

Solicitor Wilson's Testimony Regarding Detective Bell.

THE EMMA MINE INVESTIGATION.

FROM OUR REGULAR CORRESPONDENT.

WASHINGTON, April 10, 1876.

THE LETTER WHICH GENERAL BABCOCK RECEIVED FROM WHITLEY PRODUCED BEFORE THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE—A STRONG POINT FOR THE LATE PRIVATE SECRETARY—THE ALIBI WHICH WAS ESTABLISHED IN THE SAFE BURGLARY CASE.

General Babcock went boldly before the Judiciary Committee to-day with the original of the letter he received from Whitley, the answer to which, produced before the committee on Friday last, was perverted into meaning that General Babcock referred to the safe burglary case when he held out the closing words of encouragement. The letter shows that Whitley was far from referring to the safe burglary in this letter, and the perverted use of General Babcock's answer which, when the two letters are placed side by side, is wholly innocent, has given all of the testimony of Whitley a suspicious character and caused the witness to be regarded as not altogether disinterested in his profession, that he is making a clean breast of his complicity in the conspiracy. The fact has greatly reassured the friends of General Babcock, especially as Whitley is placed in the predicament of having sworn falsely when he was tried for the conspiracy in the local courts here in October, 1874, or when he appeared before the committee last Friday.

But the scandal involved in the case does not end here. There is no disguising the fact that the public are disposed to accept Whitley as telling the truth now, and General Babcock is suffering accordingly. But if Whitley is really telling the truth the mischief of his testimony will not end with the disgrace of General Babcock. The Associated Press told you to-day how, at the trial of Whitley in Washington, Mike Hayes, one of the implicated parties who turned State's evidence, testified that Whitley met him in New York and sent him to Washington to carry out the plan of the burglary. Whitley contradicted Hayes' story, saying he was in Boston at the time of the alleged interview and produced several witnesses to show that fact and establishing the alibi. The same report goes on to say that Whitley, in his recent testimony before the Judiciary Committee, confirmed all the statements of Mike Hayes, for which he previously had him arrested for perjury.

To repeat, if Whitley is telling the truth, a host of reputations must suffer. He established an alibi, which he now leaves the public to believe was false upon the testimony of the several persons hereafter enumerated.

No less a person than Harrison W. Hagedy, Deputy Collector of the port of Boston, swore that he was present at Whitley's dinner party in Boston on the night of April 1, 1874, and saw and conversed with Whitley. An official of the Boston Custom House, William H. Bates, testified that he called to see Whitley, and found him at a house entertaining his friends at dinner on the date referred to, and James Filley, a Boston detective, swore that he got an invitation the night before from Whitley to assist at this dinner party. H. P. Hutchinson, of Springfield, Mass., swore that he saw Whitley at the depot in Springfield on the morning of the 6th, the day following the dinner party, when he was en route to New York, and W. W. Applegate and Detective Newcome, of New York, testified to his arrival there. The alibi being thus proved, and Mike Hayes' testimony as to his getting his burlesque instructions on these dates discredited, the question recurs—What Whitley swears falsely at his own trial or to tell the truth to President Knott's committee the other day? This is the conundrum Washington is trying to guess to-night.

THE MEXICAN CLAIMS COMMISSION—AN EXTENSION OF TIME NECESSARY—COMMUNICATION FROM SECRETARY FISH TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE.

The following communication from Secretary Fish in relation to the Mexican Claims Commission was received by the Chairman of the Appropriation Committee to-day. Mr. Fish shows what has been done toward the settlement of two claims, and makes suggestions as to extending the time of the court suit to allow of finishing the case on the calendar. He suggests that as Minister Thornton will not receive pay for his services as umpire, he be presented with an appropriate testimonial.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON, D. C., April 8, 1876.

HON. SAMUEL J. HANDALL, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, U. S. House of Representatives.

SIR—The convention between the United States and Mexico for the settlement of claims under the treaty signed at Mexico, January 30, 1868, and extended, on January 31, 1870, is now in progress. The commission appointed under the treaty has been working since that date to complete its work. At the expiration of the commission's term, the case asked for time to complete before his 162 cases for decision, and some fifteen others in which motions for rehearing, revision, etc., are pending. Many of these claims are large, and the documentary and other evidence is exceedingly voluminous. Although he has used every effort to dispose of these cases as he has, at this date, undisposed of cases are still in his hands. He has endeavored to dispose of these cases within the time allowed by the Convention, and that, in case he is to dispose of the balance of the cases, he has asked for time to be granted him. I have been informed by the Mexican Minister of the readiness of his government to join the United States in extending the time of the umpire until January 1, 1877, and the matter is to be referred to the claims from both countries, particularly to our own citizens who have claims pending to a very large amount. No appropriation has been made for the coming year for this commission, as it was supposed at the time the estimates were made up that the umpire would be able to close the work during the present fiscal year. Should the umpire be able to dispose of all the cases by the end of July, such a considerable part of the clerical and subordinate force of the commission will not be required during the months of July and August, in connection with the umpire, entering decisions and in performing the closing acts. If an extension is agreed to, the force, including the staff, will be required until the close of the labor of the umpire.

I enclose a statement of the unexpended balance of appropriations for salaries and contingent expenses of the commission, a large part of which is available and not entered into the Treasury. No new appropriations will be required, but it is desired that so much of the unexpended balance as is available be transferred to the contingent expenses remaining unexpended on the 30th day of June, 1876, as shall be necessary for the purpose of the commission. It is believed that a reduction may shortly be made in the number of translators and clerks, but it is difficult to fix a precise date for such reduction. The law provides a salary of \$3,000 for the umpire. Sir Edward Thornton was appointed October 15th, 1875. He has performed an enormous amount of labor, and with a very few exceptions, the commission uniformly differed and the cases have gone to the umpire. He has declined to receive any salary for such. It is suggested as eminently proper, under the circumstances, that authority be given to the Secretary of State to draw the salary of the umpire, which will remain unexpended on the 30th day of June, 1876, as shall be necessary for the purpose of the commission. The following is suggested as an amendment to be incorporated in the legislative bill—

That so much of the appropriation heretofore made for salaries of the United States and Mexican Claims Commission as may remain unexpended on the 30th day of June, 1876, be and it is hereby so ordered, to be used in the salaries of the umpire, secretary, clerks, translators and messengers, at the rates now respectively allowed to them for a period not to exceed six months.

months from the 1st of July 1876, and the unexpended balance for contingent expenses of such commission for a like period; and that the amount which remains unexpended on the 30th day of June, 1876, be the appropriation for salary of the umpire, or so much thereof, as may be necessary for the purpose, may be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, in acknowledgment of the services of the umpire.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant.

HAMILTON FISH.

THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF UNEXPENDED BALANCES FROM JUNE 30, 1872, TO JUNE 30, 1876, WAS \$26,573.92, AND THE AMOUNT OF CONTINGENT EXPENSES TO JUNE 30, 1876, WAS \$1,114. The salaries for six months ending September 30, 1876, were \$3,000, and miscellaneous expenses \$1,200.

CONTESTED SEATS IN THE HOUSE—TWO REPUBLICAN MEMBERS TO BE OUSTED.

The Committee on Elections have decided to oust two sitting republican members and give the seats to the contestants, democrats, and the decision of the committee will be raised as soon as the reports of the committee can be acted upon by the House. In the case of Spencer against Morcy, of the Fifth district of Louisiana, the decision of the committee was unanimous, but in the contest of Lemoine for Farwell's seat for the Third district of Illinois, which is part of Chicago, the award to Lemoine was a strict party vote. Several other contested election cases yet remain to be concluded by the same committee.

IMPORTANT WITNESSES IN THE EMMA MINE INVESTIGATION.

The House Committee on Foreign Relations have summoned three new witnesses from Salt Lake City in relation to the Emma mine scandal. Three important witnesses are to be examined in the morning, and the Utah end of the scandal will be severely investigated. It will be a week or ten days before the Salt Lake witnesses can reach Washington.

FROM AN OCCASIONAL CORRESPONDENT.

WASHINGTON, April 10, 1876.

WHO IS TO BE THE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE OF THE DEMOCRATS?—WINDFELD SCOTT HANCOCK THE COMING MAN—THE OBJECTIONS TO THE AVAILABILITY OF THE PROMINENT LEADERS CONSIDERED—PUBLIC SENTIMENT CENTERING ON THE HERO OF A HUNDRED BATTLES.

If the honest, impartial opinion of nine out of ten of the democrats one meets here from all parts of the country, from Maine to California, can be taken as a criterion upon which to predict future results, General Winfield Scott Hancock is the coming man, the one who is to receive the nomination at St. Louis, in June next, as the candidate of the democracy for the Presidency. This opinion is surely becoming stronger day by day. Not that Hancock is the first choice for that high office of nine out of ten democrats, because the first-choice favorites are Thurman, Tilden, Bayard and Hendricks. Each member of this quartet has his ardent and devoted followers; each is earnestly supported in the Convention, and either if nominated would be in the highest degree satisfactory to the great mass of the democratic party both in the North and in the South; but to each there is, from various causes, just enough opposition to render the nomination of either a dangerous experiment for the democrats to adopt. Bayard—without fear and without reproach—stands on an insignificant stage; one, too, whose electoral vote is sure to be cast for the nominee of the National Democratic Convention. Besides this, the insinuation thrown out against him in the Senate the other day—groundless though it was—is sufficient to show that the radicals, at least the Jacobins of the party, would endeavor to cast suspicion upon the strength of his Union sentiments should he become the standard bearer of the democracy. He would be held up as too strongly tainted with Democraticism. As the same time those who know the party and patriotism which predominate in Bayard's character only regret that the Presidential chair is not certain to be filled by so able and honorable an occupant.

Hendricks, while possessing some show of strength, has also exhibited evidence of great weakness. First, he is not known to be a man of firm convictions, particularly upon questions which are sure to occupy a prominent place in the ensuing Presidential canvass. He has some bitter opponents within the ranks of his own party. This is notably true in Ohio, where Hendricks is anything but popular.

Tilden seems to have lost ground as a Presidential candidate. This is partly due to two causes—First, he came to the front too early in the effort to secure the nomination. He made his race too soon, and gold attention has been called to his weaknesses. As a second element of weakness in Tilden as a candidate for the democratic nomination at St. Louis is the bitter opposition he is encountering from a portion of the New York democracy, rendering it doubtful if he can secure the united delegation of his own State, without which his chances may be regarded as next to hopeless. As the democratic nominee for Governor of New York Tilden can undoubtedly render his party a greater service than in any other capacity during the Presidential campaign, probably securing in this way the electoral vote of New York in favor of the democratic candidate, whoever he may be.

Last, but not least to be considered, is Thurman, whose high abilities, elevated character and thoroughly wise statesmanship commend him not only to the leaders and masses of his own party, but to the fair minded men of all parties. Even Senator Conkling, in an opinion once remarked that if the next President was to be a democrat he hoped, for the prosperity of the country, the choice would fall upon Thurman. It is doubtful if, at all things considered, a more desirable President could be selected from among the leaders of either party than would be found in Senator Thurman; but alas! he, too, has his drawbacks when availability is considered. He has been unfortunate enough to encounter opposition of a most serious character in the ranks of the Ohio democracy. By the way, the Ohio democracy has seemed to distinguish itself in the last few Presidential campaigns or conventions by casting its influence as to prevent success. The opposition to Thurman comes more particularly from the Cincinnati and Cleveland groups. How far this opposition might be overcome is uncertain. If Thurman becomes the national democratic standard bearer is a question of doubtful consideration. In a State like Ohio, where the strength of the two parties is so evenly divided, it is absolutely essential to study and take advantage of every element of strength.

It must also be borne in mind that, notwithstanding the great number of Senators who have in times past aspired to become President, a strange fidelity or lack of success has marked these efforts, so that the Senatorial chair has not proven a happy stepping stone from which to mount the Presidential steed. Each of the four gentlemen named is the first choice of a considerable following, yet scarcely one of their respective followers will assert that he deems the chances of his particular candidate as sufficient upon which to ground well founded hope. Nearly all admit that, granting that either one of the four should obtain and receive the entire vote of the democratic party, something still more is necessary to gain success, and that is that the candidate of the democracy must be a man who cannot only muster the entire strength of the democratic party, but who can reconcile at least a portion of the honest dissatisfied voters of the republican party to a union with their political opponents in the effort to secure a pure and patriotic administration. It is argued that republicans who are tired and disgusted with the present state of affairs will hesitate and decline to abandon their party and vote outright for a Bourbon; hence some consideration must be shown to this large and important element.

To steer clear of the difficulties which seem to surround the selection of a standard bearer for the democracy in the next campaign, and, at the same time, to present for the suffrage of the people, not only the ablest, but also the largest mass of dissatisfied republicans, a candidate unquestionable in every way, public opinion, as discerned by careful investigation and conversation with prominent and well informed men representing every section of the country and almost every phase of public sentiment, is and has been fast centering upon Hancock as the man who, judged by his personal, political and military record, aided by his high character as shown both in private and public life, combines more and greater elements of strength as the democratic nominee for the Presidency than are to be found combined in any other man. Your correspondent has conversed with representative men from almost every State whose electoral vote is at all likely to be cast for the democratic nominee, and in reply to the inquiry, "Who do you and your people

favor as the democratic candidate for the Presidency?" the answer, in substance, is either

"Our first choice is —, but I don't believe he can be elected. I think Hancock is the man." Or

"Give us Hancock, and we can elect him."

When asked wherein Hancock possesses strength over the other prominent men named as candidates, the reply is that while Hancock would receive every democratic vote which either of the candidates could above could command—viz., the full vote of the democratic party—he would, in addition, receive a large support from the liberal republican element, or, more exactly, drawing it from the dissatisfied and conservative element of the republican party. And being one of the most popular as well as successful and prominent heroes of the war, and having been wounded and having shed his blood upon more than one of the great battlefields of the war, he would obtain votes from the hundreds of thousands of soldiers which no other democratic candidate could hope to receive. His famous stand at New Orleans in defense of constitutional rights won for him not only the good will of the entire South, but of every lover of constitutional liberty in the North. His desire to render the military power entirely subordinate to the civil, as manifested in the strong argument submitted by him before the recent Court of Inquiry at Chicago, shows that under him the complete supremacy of the civil over the military power would be invariably maintained.

The time to elapse between now and the assembling of the St. Louis Convention is short. The democrats cannot expect to succeed by running an unknown, a nobody. The time has been when this might have been followed by success, but not now. The people who desire a change will not take any man or party upon trust; in such phrase, they will not, in choosing a President, "buy a pig in a poke." The man who is put forward to receive their support must be a man of known ability, unquestioned integrity and undoubted patriotism.

Winfield Scott Hancock, as the possessor of these qualities, is to-day the rising star in the Presidential sky, and but for some unforeseen contingency he is destined to become the standard bearer in the approaching Presidential battle. The nomination of Hancock would strike the principal campaign guns of such leaders as Morton and Blaine, whose stump oratory mainly consists in allusions to the bloody shirt. Besides, what more appropriate name for a Presidential candidate in this our centennial year than Hancock.

GENERAL WASHINGTON DESPATCHES.

WASHINGTON, April 10, 1876.

WHITLEY'S LETTER TO GENERAL BABCOCK—THE DETECTIVE'S REQUEST OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY, AND WHAT CAME OF IT—AN INNOCENT MATTER TWISTED INTO A BAD PURPOSE, AS ALLEGED.

General Babcock appeared before the Committee on the Judiciary to-day and produced the letter of Colonel Whitley, the substance of which he endeavored to give on Saturday, the original not having been found by him among his private papers until yesterday. The letter is as follows:—

No. 100 School Street, Boston, Mass.

MY DEAR GENERAL:—I learn you are now in Washington. I am going to request a favor of you, and if you can help me, and it is consistent for you to do so, I shall feel ever so much obliged to you. Up to the present time I have been unable to obtain my pay for the month of August; for what cause, except it be on account of the notice extorted from me by Mr. Wilson, I am at a loss to understand. I believe if you were to lay the matter before Secretary Brewster he would order me to be paid; for he did not appear to feel unfriendly toward me when I last saw him.

As to the course which has been pursued toward the members of the secret service force I have little to say at present, except to say that I have been treated fairly; but the reward for my services and a half year's faithful service rendered to the government seemingly has come; and that has all been accomplished by the simple means of one man, unsupported by evidence in any sense of the word, acting directly under the counsel of William P. Wood and Mr. Gibson of the Sea. More than that I have no right to say.

I need my money very much, and I hope you will be able to help me to get it at once, as I have no good reason to detain it. I am, very respectfully, yours, C. E. BABCOCK.

The following was the reply to Colonel Whitley's letter:—

DEAR COLONEL:—Your letter from Boston has been received. I attended to the matter yesterday. Before I can reach you you and your men will be paid. You have sent a man to pay them. You may send your time and wait in confidence the result. Your services are bound to be appreciated.

There are some letters which, however, were probably written in November, 1874.

EX-SOLICITOR HANDLED CONFIRMS THE TESTIMONY OF GENERAL BABCOCK, THAT ABOUT THE LAST OF MARCH, 1874, HE, AT THE REQUEST OF BABCOCK, SENT TO COLONEL WHITLEY TO COME AND SEE THE GENERAL, WHICH WHITLEY DID, BUT HE KNOWS NOTHING OF THE BUSINESS BETWEEN THEM, NOR HAS HE ANY KNOWLEDGE OF THE BURGLARY CONSPIRACY FURTHER THAN THE PUBLISHED REPORTS AND THE RUMORS WHICH REACHED HERE, WHICH ARE NOT CONSIDERED AS TESTIMONY. The call made at the Solicitor's office by General Babcock in response to Whitley's letter was after Mr. Handfield had been succeeded as Solicitor by Buford Wilson, and, consequently, Handfield knows nothing about the matter. (The name of Mr. Handfield was on Saturday erroneously stated in this connection instead of that of Mr. Wilson.)

EX-ATTORNEY GENERAL WILLIAMS REPEATS TO-DAY THAT HE HAD NO ORDER FROM THE PRESIDENT OR SUGGESTION FROM GENERAL BABCOCK TO DISMISS THE SAFE BURGLARY CASE, AND THAT THE RUMORS WERE ENTERED AFTER FULL CONSULTATION WITH MESSRS. RIDDLE AND HILL, SPECIAL GOVERNMENT COUNSEL, THE SUPREME COURT OF THE DISTRICT HAVING DECLARED THE GRAND JURY WHICH FOUND TRUE BILLS AGAINST HARRINGTON AND OTHERS TO BE ILLEGAL, AND, BESIDES, AT THAT TIME THE TRIAL HAD TAKEN PLACE SHOWED THAT THERE WAS NOT SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE TO CONVICT, BUT IT WAS THOUGHT THERE WOULD BE AT SOME FUTURE TIME.

MR. RIDDLE SAYS THAT HE INTENDED TO BRING THE CASE BEFORE THE NEXT GRAND JURY, HAVING MADE ARRANGEMENTS TO RECEIVE NEW TESTIMONY THROUGH COLONEL WHITLEY, BUT HIS DISMISSAL AS SPECIAL COUNSEL PREVENTED HIM FROM DOING SO.

COLONEL WHITLEY'S TESTIMONY IN THE SAFE BURGLARY CASE.

The Republican says:—"In the Harrington trial of the safe burglary case, some eighteen months ago, Mr. Whitley, chief of the detective force of the Treasury Department, was called to the stand and sworn. The following is from the record of the trial:—

Q. Had you any knowledge of the safe robbery here in Boston, and of the persons who were named in the papers and what has been told me; that's all.

A. And knew nothing of it in advance of its being told me. A. Nothing in any way whatever, in the slightest."

THE BELL-BABCOCK MATTER—TESTIMONY OF SOLICITOR WILSON—THE DETECTIVE'S STORY PARTIALLY CONFIRMED—A FEELING OF DISTRAUST ALL ROUND.

The Committee on Expenditures of the War Department met to-day. Buford Wilson, Solicitor of the Treasury, testified that he first met Bell in the fall of 1874, when he was in applicant for the position of chief of the Secret Service bureau of the Treasury Department. He did not appoint Bell because of information he had that shook his confidence in him. Bell was never in the employ of the Treasury Department in the Secret Service division. He was employed in the Revenue Bureau to get the Hoge papers. Hoge was not prosecuted because he left the country. Witness met Bell about the 10th or 12th of February. Bell came to his house and told him substantially the same story he told the committee. Bell had never been employed on the detective force of the Treasury proper, because witness had learned from detectives of his associations with General Babcock, Mr. Luckey and Mr. Bradley, and believed that he was employed by the defense to look into the hands of the prosecution.

Witness was questioned as to whether Mr. Sherman, sent out from New York to St. Louis, went there in the interest of the defense. He replied that from his knowledge he got from Mr. Dyer and others there he thought that Mr. Sherman was using the opportunity he had in the interests of the defense; but that since then he had talked with Mr. Dyer and Mr. Sherman and his former opinions are considerably modified, and he is not satisfied now that Mr. Sherman went there, or acted while there in the interest of the defense; with regard to Bell, witness said he wrote to Dyer that he must be careful not to trust Bell; that he was really in the employ of the defense; Bell called on the witness about the middle of December last with a letter from Mr. Dyer; witness grew suspicious of Bell, and hence the letter to Mr. Dyer; he believed Bell was in the service of Babcock, and did not want to employ him because he did not see how he could serve

two masters faithfully; he believed Bell to be a spy on Mr. Dyer, and so warned Mr. Dyer; about the 10th or 12th of February Bell called at witness's office and repeated the story that he had been in the employ of the defense and wanted to be employed by the prosecution. He spoke of the express packages to Bradley, despatches sent by Babcock signed by B. Finch, or Bullfinch, and showed him the cipher that was published in the New York Herald. It was identified as partly in Luckey's handwriting, and witness was quite impressed with the story, though he was cautious in his mind. Witness telegraphed to Dyer that Bell had told him that story, and he telegraphed to Dyer, answered:—"If you think Bell is the truth send him here. When we despatches and express packages sent?" Wilson telegraphed to Dyer:—"That man Bell has Secretary Chandler's cipher in his pocket." Dyer afterward telegraphed to Wilson:—"We do not trust the fellow of whom you spoke." On the 10th of February Mr. Dyer telegraphed that, after an hour's conversation with Mr. Brodhead, it was decided, the other counsel concurring, not to use Bell except in rebuttal. Wilson telegraphed to Eaton, associate counsel, that he was satisfied with the conclusion arrived at regarding Bell, as it seemed to have been reached after careful consideration. Witness met Bell at the White House on January 10, and asked him why he did not go directly to the President and tell him the same story he told him (Wilson). Witness said he did not know whether Bell saw him. Bell once came to witness's house and told a very remarkable story about Avery. He said that Avery had been harshly dealt with; had been left to bear the brunt of the battle; had been impoverished himself, and was then ready to turn State's evidence. Bell said that Avery wanted to see the Secretary of the Treasury or the Attorney General and was ready to talk. Witness said his suspicions were very strong then, as they have been since, that the story could not be implicitly trusted. Witness told Bell to go to the Attorney General with the Avery story. With regard to Bell's statement of him touching the Babcock and Luckey affair, witness regarded it as something worthy of consideration because of the production of the cipher. The fact that he had a commission under Secretary Chandler, and because he repeated to him a member of the substance of Bell's story, but does not know whether Bell saw him. Bell once came to witness's house and told a very remarkable story about Avery. He said that Avery had been harshly dealt with; had been left to bear the brunt of the battle; had been impoverished himself, and was then ready to turn State's evidence. Bell said that Avery wanted to see the Secretary of the Treasury or the Attorney General and was ready to talk. Witness said his suspicions were very strong then, as they have been since, that the story could not be implicitly trusted. Witness told Bell to go to the Attorney General with the Avery story. With regard to Bell's statement of him touching the Babcock and Luckey affair, witness regarded it as something worthy of consideration because of the production of the cipher. The fact that he had a commission under Secretary Chandler, and because he repeated to him a member of the substance of Bell's story, but does not know whether Bell saw him. Bell once came to witness's house and told a very remarkable story about Avery. He said that Avery had been harshly dealt with; had been left to bear the brunt of the battle; had been impoverished himself, and was then ready to turn State's evidence. Bell said that Avery wanted to see the Secretary of the Treasury or the Attorney General and was ready to talk. Witness said his suspicions were very strong then, as they have been since, that the story could not be implicitly trusted. Witness told Bell to go to the Attorney General with the Avery story. With regard to Bell's statement of him touching the Babcock and Luckey affair, witness regarded it as something worthy of consideration because of the production of the cipher. The fact that he had a commission under Secretary Chandler, and because he repeated to him a member of the substance of Bell's story, but does not know whether Bell saw him. Bell once came to witness's house and told a very remarkable story about Avery. He said that Avery had been harshly dealt with; had been left to bear the brunt of the battle; had been impoverished himself, and was then ready to turn State's evidence. Bell said that Avery wanted to see the Secretary of the Treasury or the Attorney General and was ready to talk. Witness said his suspicions were very strong then, as they have been since, that the story could not be implicitly trusted. Witness told Bell to go to the Attorney General with the Avery story. With regard to Bell's statement of him touching the Babcock and Luckey affair, witness regarded it as something worthy of consideration because of the production of the cipher. The fact that he had a commission under Secretary Chandler, and because he repeated to him a member of the substance of Bell's story, but does not know whether Bell saw him. Bell once came to witness's house and told a very remarkable story about Avery. He said that Avery had been harshly dealt with; had been left to bear the brunt of the battle; had been impoverished himself, and was then ready to turn State's evidence. Bell said that Avery wanted to see the Secretary of the Treasury or the Attorney General and was ready to talk. Witness said his suspicions were very strong then, as they have been since, that the story could not be implicitly trusted. Witness told Bell to go to the Attorney General with the Avery story. With regard to Bell's statement of him touching the Babcock and Luckey affair, witness regarded it as something worthy of consideration because of the production of the cipher. The fact that he had a commission under Secretary Chandler, and because he repeated to him a member of the substance of Bell's story, but does not know whether Bell saw him. Bell once came to witness's house and told a very remarkable story about Avery. He said that Avery had been harshly dealt with; had been left to bear the brunt of the battle; had been impoverished himself, and was then ready to turn State's evidence. Bell said that Avery wanted to see the Secretary of the Treasury or the Attorney General and was ready to talk. Witness said his suspicions were very strong then, as they have been since, that the story could not be implicitly trusted. Witness told Bell to go to the Attorney General with the Avery story. With regard to Bell's statement of him touching the Babcock and Luckey affair, witness regarded it as something worthy of consideration because of the production of the cipher. The fact that he had a commission under Secretary Chandler, and because he repeated to him a member of the substance of Bell's story, but does not know whether Bell saw him. Bell once came to witness's house and told a very remarkable story about Avery. He said that Avery had been harshly dealt with; had been left to bear the brunt of the battle; had been impoverished himself, and was then ready to turn State's evidence. Bell said that Avery wanted to see the Secretary of the Treasury or the Attorney General and was ready to talk. Witness said his suspicions were very strong then, as they have been since, that the story could not be implicitly trusted. Witness told Bell to go to the Attorney General with the Avery story. With regard to Bell's statement of him touching the Babcock and Luckey affair, witness regarded it as something worthy of consideration because of the production of the cipher. The fact that he had a commission under Secretary Chandler, and because he repeated to him a member of the substance of Bell's story, but does not know whether Bell saw him. Bell once came to witness's house and told a very remarkable story about Avery. He said that Avery had been harshly dealt with; had been left to bear the brunt of the battle; had been impoverished himself, and was then ready to turn State's evidence. Bell said that Avery wanted to see the Secretary of the Treasury or the Attorney General and was ready to talk. Witness said his suspicions were very strong then, as they have been since, that the story could not be implicitly trusted. Witness told Bell to go to the Attorney General with the Avery story. With regard to Bell's statement of him touching the Babcock and Luckey affair, witness regarded it as something worthy of consideration because of the production of the cipher. The fact that he had a commission under Secretary Chandler, and because he repeated to him a member of the substance of Bell's story, but does not know whether Bell saw him. Bell once came to witness's house and told a very remarkable story about Avery. He said that Avery had been harshly dealt with; had been left to bear the brunt of the battle; had been impoverished himself, and was then ready to turn State's evidence. Bell said that Avery wanted to see the Secretary of the Treasury or the Attorney General and was ready to talk. Witness said his suspicions were very strong then, as they have been since, that the story could not be implicitly trusted. Witness told Bell to go to the Attorney General with the Avery story. With regard to Bell's statement of him touching the Babcock and Luckey affair, witness regarded it as something worthy of consideration because of the production of the cipher. The fact that he had a commission under Secretary Chandler, and because he repeated to him a member of the substance of Bell's story, but does not know whether Bell saw him. Bell once came to witness's house and told a very remarkable story about Avery. He said that Avery had been harshly dealt with; had been left to bear the brunt of the battle; had been impoverished himself, and was then ready to turn State's evidence. Bell said that Avery wanted to see the Secretary of the Treasury or the Attorney General and was ready to talk. Witness said his suspicions were very strong then, as they have been since, that the story could not be implicitly trusted. Witness told Bell to go to the Attorney General with the Avery story. With regard to Bell's statement of him touching the Babcock and Luckey affair, witness regarded it as something worthy of consideration because of the production of the cipher. The fact that he had a commission under Secretary Chandler, and because he repeated to him a member of the substance of Bell's story, but does not know whether Bell saw him. Bell once came to witness's house and told a very remarkable story about Avery. He said that Avery had been harshly dealt with; had been left to bear the brunt of the battle; had been impoverished himself, and was then ready to turn State's evidence. Bell said that Avery wanted to see the Secretary of the Treasury or the Attorney General and was ready to talk. Witness said his suspicions were very strong then, as they have been since, that the story could not be implicitly trusted. Witness told Bell to go to the Attorney General with the Avery story. With regard to Bell's statement of him touching the Babcock and Luckey affair, witness regarded it as something worthy of consideration because of the production of the cipher. The fact that he had a commission under Secretary Chandler, and because he repeated to him a member of the substance of Bell's story, but does not know whether Bell saw him. Bell once came to witness's house and told a very remarkable story about Avery. He said that Avery had been harshly dealt with; had been left to bear the brunt of the battle; had been impoverished himself, and was then ready to turn State's evidence. Bell said that Avery wanted to see the Secretary of the Treasury or the Attorney General and was ready to talk. Witness said his suspicions were very strong then, as they have been since, that the story could not be implicitly trusted. Witness told Bell to go to the Attorney General with the Avery story. With regard to Bell's statement of him touching the Babcock and Luckey affair, witness regarded it as something worthy of consideration because of the production of the cipher. The fact that he had a commission under Secretary Chandler, and because he repeated to him a member of the substance of Bell's story, but does not know whether Bell saw him. Bell once came to witness's house and told a very remarkable story about Avery. He said that Avery had been harshly dealt with; had been left to bear the brunt of the battle; had been impoverished himself, and was then ready to turn State's evidence. Bell said that Avery wanted to see the Secretary of the Treasury or the Attorney General and was ready to talk. Witness said his suspicions were very strong then, as they have been since, that the story could not be implicitly trusted. Witness told Bell to go to the Attorney General with the Avery story. With regard to Bell's statement of him touching the Babcock and Luckey affair, witness regarded it as something worthy of consideration because of the production of the cipher. The fact that he had a commission under Secretary Chandler, and because he repeated to him a member of the substance of Bell's story, but does not know whether Bell saw him. Bell once came to witness's house and told a very remarkable story about Avery. He said that Avery had been harshly dealt with; had been left to bear the brunt of the battle; had been impoverished himself, and was then ready to turn State's evidence. Bell said that Avery wanted to see the Secretary of the Treasury or the Attorney General and was ready to talk. Witness said his suspicions were very strong then, as they have been since, that the story could not be implicitly trusted. Witness told Bell to go to the Attorney General with the Avery story. With regard to Bell's statement of him touching the Babcock and Luckey affair, witness regarded it as something worthy of consideration because of the production of the cipher. The fact that he had a commission under Secretary Chandler, and because he repeated to him a member of the substance of Bell's story, but does not know whether Bell saw him. Bell once came to witness's house and told a very remarkable story about Avery. He said that Avery had been harshly dealt with; had been left to bear the brunt of the battle; had been impoverished himself, and was then ready to turn State's evidence. Bell said that Avery wanted to see the Secretary of the Treasury or the Attorney General and was ready to talk. Witness said his suspicions were very strong then, as they have been since, that the story could not be implicitly trusted. Witness told Bell to go to the Attorney General with the Avery story. With regard to Bell's statement of him touching the Babcock and Luckey affair, witness regarded it as something worthy of consideration because of the production of the cipher. The fact that he had a commission under Secretary Chandler, and because he repeated to him a member of the substance of Bell's story, but does not know whether Bell saw him. Bell once came to witness's house and told a very remarkable story about Avery. He said that Avery had been harshly dealt with; had been left to bear the brunt of the battle; had been impoverished himself, and was then ready to turn State's evidence. Bell said that Avery wanted to see the Secretary of the Treasury or the Attorney General and was ready to talk. Witness said his suspicions were very strong then, as they have been since, that the story could not be implicitly trusted. Witness told Bell to go to the Attorney General with the Avery story. With regard to Bell's statement of him touching the Babcock and Luckey affair, witness regarded it as something worthy of consideration because of the production of the cipher. The fact that he had a commission under Secretary Chandler, and because he repeated to him a member of the substance of Bell's story, but does not know whether Bell saw him. Bell once came to witness's house and told a very remarkable story about Avery. He said that Avery had been harshly dealt with; had been left to bear the brunt of the battle; had been impoverished himself, and was then ready to turn State's evidence. Bell said that Avery wanted to see the Secretary of the Treasury or the Attorney General and was ready to talk. Witness said his suspicions were very strong then, as they have been since, that the story could not be implicitly trusted. Witness told Bell to go to the Attorney General with the Avery story. With regard to Bell's statement of him touching the Babcock and Luckey affair, witness regarded it as something worthy of consideration because of the production of the cipher. The fact that he had a commission under Secretary Chandler, and because he repeated to him a member of the substance of Bell's story, but does not know whether Bell saw him. Bell once came to witness's house and told a very remarkable story about Avery. He said that Avery had been harshly dealt with; had been left to bear the brunt of the battle; had been impoverished himself, and was then ready to turn State's evidence. Bell said that Avery wanted to see the Secretary of the Treasury or the Attorney General and was ready to talk. Witness said his suspicions were very strong then, as they have been since, that the story could not be implicitly trusted. Witness told Bell to go to the Attorney General with the Avery story. With regard to Bell's statement of him touching the Babcock and Luckey affair, witness regarded it as something worthy of consideration because of the production of the cipher. The fact that he had a commission under Secretary Chandler, and because he repeated to him a member of the substance of Bell's story, but does not know whether Bell saw him. Bell once came to witness's house and told a very remarkable story about Avery. He said that Avery had been harshly dealt with; had been left to bear the brunt of the battle; had been impoverished himself, and was then ready to turn State's evidence. Bell said that Avery wanted to see the Secretary of the Treasury or the Attorney General and was ready to talk. Witness said his suspicions were very strong then, as they have been since, that the story could not be implicitly trusted. Witness told Bell to go to the Attorney General with the Avery story. With regard to Bell's statement of him touching the Babcock and Luckey affair, witness regarded it as something worthy of consideration because of the production of the cipher. The fact that he had a commission under Secretary Chandler, and because he repeated to him a member of the substance of Bell's story, but does not know whether Bell saw him. Bell once came to witness's house and told a very remarkable story about Avery. He said that Avery had been harshly dealt with; had been left to bear the brunt of the battle; had been impoverished himself, and was then ready to turn State's evidence. Bell said that Avery wanted to see the Secretary of the Treasury or the Attorney General and was ready to talk. Witness said his suspicions were very strong then, as they have been since, that the story could not be implicitly trusted. Witness told Bell to go to the Attorney General with the Avery story. With regard to Bell's statement of him touching the Babcock and Luckey affair, witness regarded it as something worthy of consideration because of the production of the cipher. The fact that he had a commission under Secretary Chandler, and because he repeated to him a member of the substance of Bell's story, but does not know whether Bell saw him. Bell once came to witness's house and told a very remarkable story about Avery. He said that Avery had been harshly dealt with; had been left to bear the brunt of the battle; had been impoverished himself, and was then ready to turn State's evidence. Bell said that Avery wanted to see the Secretary of the Treasury or the Attorney General and was ready to talk. Witness said his suspicions were very strong then, as they have been since, that the story could not be implicitly trusted. Witness told Bell to go to the Attorney General with the Avery story. With regard to Bell's statement of him touching the Babcock and Luckey affair, witness regarded it as something worthy of consideration because of the production of the cipher. The fact that he had a commission under Secretary Chandler, and because he repeated to him a member of the substance of Bell's story, but does not know whether Bell saw him. Bell once came to witness's house and told a very remarkable story about Avery. He said that Avery had been harshly dealt with; had been left to bear the brunt of the battle; had been impoverished himself, and was then ready to turn State's evidence. Bell said that Avery wanted to see the Secretary of the Treasury or the Attorney General and was ready to talk. Witness said his suspicions were very strong then, as they have been since, that the story could not be implicitly trusted. Witness told Bell to go to the Attorney General with the Avery story. With regard to Bell's statement of him touching the Babcock and Luckey affair, witness regarded it as something worthy of consideration because of the production of the cipher. The fact that he had a commission under Secretary Chandler, and because he repeated to him a member of the substance of Bell's story, but does not know whether Bell saw him. Bell once came to witness's house and told a very remarkable story about Avery. He said that Avery had been harshly dealt with; had been left to bear the brunt of the battle; had been impoverished himself, and was then ready to turn State's evidence. Bell said that Avery wanted to see the Secretary of the Treasury or the Attorney General and was ready to talk. Witness said his suspicions were very strong then, as they have been since, that the story could not be implicitly trusted. Witness told Bell to go to the Attorney General with the Avery story. With regard to Bell's statement of him touching the Babcock and Luckey affair, witness regarded it as something worthy of consideration because of the production of the cipher. The fact that he had a commission under Secretary Chandler, and because he repeated to him a member of the substance of Bell's story, but does not know whether Bell saw him. Bell once came to witness's house and told a very remarkable story about Avery. He said that Avery had been harshly dealt with; had been left to bear the brunt of the battle; had been impoverished himself, and was then ready to turn State's evidence. Bell said that Avery wanted to see the Secretary of the Treasury or the Attorney General and was ready to talk. Witness said his suspicions were very strong then, as they have been since, that the story could not be implicitly trusted. Witness told Bell to go to the Attorney General with the Avery story. With regard to Bell's statement of him touching the Babcock and Luckey affair, witness regarded it as something worthy of consideration because of the production of the cipher. The fact that he had a commission under Secretary Chandler, and because he repeated to him a member of the substance of Bell's story, but does not know whether Bell saw him. Bell once came to witness's house and told a very remarkable story about Avery. He said that Avery had been harshly dealt with; had been left to bear the br